



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

V.S.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/873,289 06/11/97 CHOI

C P54562

ROBERT E BUSHNELL
1511 K STREET NW
SUITE 425
WASHINGTON DC 20005-1401

LM02/0405

EXAMINER

LUU, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2778

DATE MAILED: 04/05/99

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/873,289

Applicant(s)

CHOI

Examiner

LUU

Group Art Unit

2775

6

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on June 11, 1997.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2775

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumaki (5,619,229) in view of Ishizaki et al (5,748,171).

Regarding claim 1, Kumaki discloses (Figs. 1 and 6) a data input unit (Fig. 1, color temperature adjusting unit 5), a microcomputer (1 and 2), and Fig. 6 discloses a digital to analog converter (D/A) (20). See column 7, lines 19-26.

The only difference between the disclosure of Kumaki and the claimed invention is that the Kumaki reference teaches the using of color temperature coefficient to adjust the brightness of the monitor, instead of adjusting the colors as claimed by the invention.

However, Ishizaki from the similar field of endeavor discloses (Fig. 7) a data input unit (206) and a microcomputer (transformation control 204) for adjusting the color values based on the temperature detected from the temperature detection circuit (213). See column 7, lines 4-18. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

Art Unit: 2775

use the temperature detection circuit into the color display apparatus of Kumaki so that the three primary color values can be adjusted according to the changing of the temperature.

Regarding claim 2, note the rejection as set forth above. Kumaki further teaches (Fig. 6) a multiplexer (22-25).

Regarding claim 3, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 1. Ishizaki further teaches (Fig. 7) the temperature sensing means (213); and Kumaki teaches (Fig. 4) the known keypad (11).

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Endo (5,852,430) teaches the color liquid crystal display device, wherein the colors can be adjusted regardless of various liquid driving conditions such as temperature.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Matthew Luu at telephone number (703) 305-4850.

M. Luu: *ML*

March 28, 1999



**MATTHEW LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER**